

HARE SYSTEM OF PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

EFFECTIVE VOTING REAL DEMOCRACY

For State Legislatures, City Councils and Commissions, and the
Governing Bodies of Clubs, Chambers of Commerce,
Labor Unions, Employees' Organizations,
Political Parties, Etc.

The Hare system of proportional representation, otherwise called the Hare-Spence system or the "single transferable vote," is used for the election of several parliaments and many city councils and other local bodies in the English-speaking world. In America it is used for the election of the council or commission in three cities, Ashtabula, Ohio (since 1915), Boulder, Colorado (since 1917), and Kalamazoo, Michigan (since 1918). It is also used for the election of the representative bodies of many private organizations including those of several great trade unions in England and Canada and that of the National Women's Trade Union League of America.

As used in America this method of voting is mainly the creation of Thomas Hare (England—first edition of book, 1859), Catherine Helen Spence (Australia—died 1910), and the workers of the Proportional Representation Society (England) and the American Proportional Representation League.

Object

The object of the system is the election of legislative bodies truly representative of the voters.

The Multi-Member District

As with nearly every other system of proportional representation—"P. R.", as it is called for short—its basis is the election of the members of the body not from single-member districts but at large—as at Ashtabula, Boulder, and Kalamazoo—or by districts large enough to deserve several members each, preferably between five and fifteen.

Nominations

No primaries are required. Under the Hare system the method of marking and counting the ballots brings together the votes of like-minded voters—far more effectively than a primary election can do it—so as not only to elect

the right number of each party's candidates, but to elect the *strongest candidates* of each party, group, or sufficient number of voters, whether organized or not. Candidates are nominated by petition, the number of names required on a petition being usually from about one half of one per cent to about two per cent of the voters.

Ballot and Voting

The form of the ballot and the method of voting are shown below. Of course no significance should be attached to the particular names used in this illustration.

SAMPLE BALLOT

[Heading]

DIRECTIONS TO VOTERS: -

Put the figure 1 opposite the name of your first choice. If you want to express also second, third, and other choices, do so by putting the figure 2 opposite the name of your second choice, the figure 3 opposite the name of your third choice, and so on. In this way you may express as many choices as you please. **The more choices you express, the surer you are to make your ballot count for one of the candidates you favor.**

This ballot will not be counted for your second choice unless it is found that it cannot help your first; it will not be counted for your third choice unless it is found that it cannot help either your first or your second; etc.

A ballot is spoiled if the figure 1 is put opposite more than one name. If you spoil this ballot, tear it across once, return it to the election officer in charge of the ballots, and get another from him.

FOR THE COUNCIL

	William E. Borah
	Louis D. Brandeis
	Eugene V. Debs
	Samuel Gompers
	Hiram W. Johnson
	William G. McAdoo
	John Spargo
	William H. Taft
	Woodrow Wilson

The Precinct Count

At each voting precinct the ballots cast there are simply sorted according to first choices; then the first choices for each candidate are counted and made up into a package, and all the packages are sent to the central counting place

of the entire multi-member district. This presents no difficulties to the precinct election officials.

The Central Count

At the central counting place the first thing done is to add up all the first choices (from all the precincts) for each candidate. (Where, as in most private elections, there is no separate precinct count, the count of first choices and the remaining operations to be described are, of course, combined.)

From this point on the system can be explained most conveniently by means of

AN ILLUSTRATIVE ELECTION

The illustration shows how representatives in a legislature would be elected from a district electing five members. It shows equally well, of course, how the members of a city council or other representative body would be elected, either at large or from one of several districts.

RESULT SHEET

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11
		2nd Count		3rd Count		4th Count		Final Count		Elected Candidates with Order of Election
	1st Count	Transfer of Wilson's Surplus	Result	Transfer of Spargo's Votes	Result	Transfer of Debs's Votes	Result	Transfer of Borah's Votes	Result	
Borah	10		10		10		10	-10		
Brandeis	7	+5	12		12	+1	13	+5	18	Brandeis (5)
Debs	6		6	+2	8	-8				
Gompers	16	+2	18		18	+2	20		20	Gompers (2)
Johnson	19		19		19		19	+1	20	Johnson (3)
McAdeo	9	+3	12		12		12	+1	13	
Spargo	2		2	-2						
Taft	17		17		17		17	+3	20	Taft (4)
Wilson	30	-10	20		20		20		20	Wilson (1)
Ineffective Ballots						+5	5		5	
Totals	116		116		116		116		116	

Ascertainment of Quota

As soon as the total number of valid ballots, in this case 116, is known, the general election board ascertains the quota, that is, *the smallest number of votes which for a certainty will secure the election of a candidate*. This number, the smallest that is so large that only five candidates can each get it when 116 votes are cast, is found by dividing 116 by 6 and taking the next whole number larger than the quotient. The division of 116 by 6 yields $19 \frac{2}{6}$. It is clear, therefore, that although six candidates might get as many as 19 votes each, it would be impossible for more than five to get as many as 20 each. The number sufficient for election, therefore,—the quota—is 20.

Election of Wilson

(Column 2)

Wilson has received more than the quota of votes. He is therefore declared elected at once.

Transfer of Wilson's Surplus

(Column 3)

As the 10 ballots received by Wilson in excess of the quota would be wasted if allowed to remain with him, they are transferred to other candidates, *each of them in accordance with the next choice expressed on it*.* Five of them go to Brandeis, giving him 12 in all; two of them to Gompers, making his total 18; and three of them to McAdoo, bringing his total up to 12.

*The question is frequently asked: *Which ten* of Wilson's thirty ballots are taken for transfer and *which twenty* are kept to elect him? (See Column 3 of the table.)

One way of settling this question is to take the ten for transfer at random from those of Wilson's thirty ballots which show a choice for some other unelected candidate, taking an equal number, as nearly as possible, from the Wilson ballots cast in each election precinct or local division of the voters. As a thorough study of this simple method shows the element of chance in it to be infinitesimal in magnitude and of such a nature as not in any case to vitiate the representative character of the group of representatives being elected, it has been widely accepted by students of election methods in America and has been adopted by Ashtabula and Kalamazoo as well as by several large private organizations.

If it is thought necessary to get rid of this trifling element of chance, this can be done by taking a little extra trouble. The procedure is easily explained. First, all the Wilson ballots are sorted out—not transferred, but merely sorted out—to find out how many of them show a next choice for each other unelected candidate. Then, any of them that show no such other choice are returned to Wilson's pile as part of the twenty to elect him. And finally, the remaining ballots required to complete Wilson's quota are taken back to him proportionately from the piles sorted out to the other candidates according to next choices. This exact method of determining which of a candidate's ballots are to be transferred as his surplus and which are to be left to make up the quota that is to elect him is used in Boulder, Colorado, and generally in those parts of the British dominions which use the Hare system.

The Hare provisions recommended by the American P. R. League give the rule in respect to the transfer of surplus ballots in two alternative forms, one prescribing the simpler method, the other the exact method. Which form is taken when the provisions are incorporated in any proposed constitution or charter



C. G. Hoag W. E. Boynton Miss Alice Henry

Electoral Officials and Clerks

Reporter
(Standing)

Prof. A. R. Hatton A. Rinto
(Candidate)

Mayo Fesler
(Standing)

Mr. Hoge Mr. Turner
(Afterwards City Manager)

FIRST PUBLIC PROPORTIONAL ELECTION IN AMERICA—HARE SYSTEM Ashtabula, Ohio, November, 1915

THE COUNT

SYSTEMS OF REPRESENTATION

Very Different Results

(Wasted votes indicated by underlining. Representatives)

THE SINGLE-MEMBER DISTRICT SYSTEM

(The usual system in the United States, England, and Canada)

<u>G</u> R	B <u>W</u>	R <u>W</u>	<u>W</u> R	B B
R <u>B</u>	<u>W</u> B	R R	R <u>W</u>	<u>W</u> <u>W</u>
<u>W</u>	B	<u>W</u>	R	B
R	B	R	R	B

Election of five representatives from five single-member districts.

In the five districts 9/25ths of the voters, designated by nine W's, vote for white candidates; 8/25ths of them, designated by eight R's, for red candidates; 7/25ths of them, designated by seven B's, for black candidates; and 1/25th of them, designated by one G, for gray candidates.

Grouped in districts as represented these voters elect three reds and two blacks.

This system is the condensation of voters into spokesmen by quotas united geographically but not in opinion and interests.

Minority rule possible, as illustrated.

The diagrams above show only the difference between any system of proportional representation on the one hand and the single-member district system or the block vote on the other. They do not show the peculiar advantages of the best system of proportional representation, the Hare.

THE BLOCK VOTE SYSTEM

(The usual system of election under the Commission of Government)

W	W	W	R
W	W	W	<u>R</u>
W	W	W	R
W	W		

Election of five representatives (each voter voting for five votes)

The voters elect five whites. Reduction of the diversity to unity by direct vote at "direct" as opposed to "proportional."

Division of voters into winning and losing minorities. Minority rule possible, as illustrated.

Besides the fundamental and obvious correction of the old representative systems shown by the diagrams, the Hare system provides also the means by which the voters of each party can exercise, without any primary elections whatever, complete control over the selection of the can-

PRESENTATION AT A GLANCE

Results with the Same Voters

Representatives elected indicated by the larger capitals.)

THE GENERAL TICKET SYSTEM

Electing the Commission
Commission-Manager Plan
(Government)

R	B	B	B	G
R	B	B		
	B	B		

W W

THE PROPORTIONAL SYSTEM—UNANIMOUS CONSTITUENCIES

(Adopted in places listed on page 11)

W W	W W	R R	R R	B B	W B G
W W	W W	R R	R R	B B	B B
W	W	R	R	B	

Representatives at large by the block
(five).

es.

diversity of interests and opinions
at the polls—a form of
“representative” democracy.

winners and losers.

illustrated.

Election of five representatives at large by the proportional or unanimous-constituency system.

The voters elect two whites, two reds, and one black.

No *division* of voters. Instead, *condensation* by voluntary unanimous quotas.

Fair representation of every large minority.

Majority rule assured.

didates who are to fill the seats to be won by the party. More than that, it even gives independent voters, who wish to cross party lines, the means of making their ballots effective. The Hare system, therefore, combining as it does the democratic control of parties and the enfranchisement of inde-

pendents with the proportional principle shown in the diagrams, provides the basis for representative government of a new kind, free from “machine” rule of the old sort and fit to be entrusted with the immense responsibilities of legislation in the troublous times before us.



C. G. Hoag
 Mrs. Raymond Robins Mrs. W. C. Anderson (Mary MacArthur)
 Miss Margaret Bondfield

Dr. Hallett

Miss Alice Henry

FIRST ELECTION UNDER THE HARE SYSTEM OF P. R. BY AN AMERICAN NATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION
 ELECTION OF EIGHT DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE

Philadelphia, June 6, 1919

THE COUNT

Transfer of Spargo's Votes

(Column 5)

It now becomes necessary for the election board to declare defeated the candidate at the bottom of the poll, in this case Spargo, and to transfer his ballots. If these ballots were allowed to remain with Spargo, they would be wasted; they should therefore be transferred to other candidates, each in accordance with the next choice on it. As both of them show a next choice for Debs, they are both transferred to him, as shown in Column 5.

Transfer of Debs's Votes

Election of Gompers

(Column 7)

The ballots of Debs, who is now at the bottom of the poll, must be transferred next. The first two of them taken show a next choice for Gompers and are therefore transferred to him. As they complete his quota, he is declared elected. The next five, not being marked for any candidate not already elected or defeated, are put into the pile of "ineffective ballots" and entered on the result sheet as such. The last of Debs's ballots, showing a next choice for Brandeis, is transferred to him.

Transfer of Borah's Votes

Election of Johnson and Taft

(Column 9)

The ballots of Borah, who now stands lowest, must next be transferred. The first one, which shows Johnson as second choice, is transferred to him, completing his quota. The next ballot, showing McAdoo as second choice, goes to him. The third, which shows Johnson as second choice and Taft as third choice, is passed to Taft because Johnson's quota is complete: under the Hare system no candidate retains more votes than are needed to complete his quota. Of the seven remaining ballots, five are transferred to Brandeis because he is the next available choice marked on them and two are transferred to Taft for a similar reason.

Election Ended

(Column 10)

When McAdoo, the candidate now lowest, is declared defeated, only one candidate, Brandeis, remains to fill the one remaining seat. It is therefore unnecessary to transfer McAdoo's ballots at all: it could not affect the result. The fifth and last seat goes to Brandeis.

should depend on such matters as the number of voters (the greater the number, the more justifiable the simpler method) and the likelihood that the simpler method will be accepted as fair by the candidates as well as by the voters.

Leaflets on the precise magnitude of the element of chance involved under the simpler rule, its character in relation to the voters and to the group of representatives elected, and the best procedure for carrying out the exact rule will be sent to any inquirer on receipt of 25c (stamps accepted).

GENERAL RESULTS

Within the limits of practicability, every voter helps elect the person whom, under the actual circumstances, he prefers to help elect. Each party or group of voters obtains representation in proportion to its strength; it also—without any troublesome and expensive primaries—secures as representatives the particular candidates it prefers. All the voters—with few exceptions—have an equal share in the election of the representative body. Each shares in the election of one member, and none shares in the election of more than one.

A body elected by this method is sure to be truly representative of the voters. It is therefore fit to be entrusted with the great powers necessary to combine with democracy *excellence* and *efficiency*, including, if it is thought best, the power to select the chief administrator. Thus in cities, for example, the Hare system of P. R. makes it possible to adopt the “city manager plan” of government, as in Ashtabula and Kalamazoo, *without sacrificing democracy*.

The Hare System *vs.* the Single-Member District System

Under the proportional system each of the five members—where the number in the district is five—is elected by about a fifth of the voters of the community, just as would be the case if the community had been divided into five districts or wards for the election of one member each. But there is a significant difference between the fifth of the voters in the one case and that in the other: under the district system it is a fifth who live together but want different persons as representative; under the proportional system it is a fifth who *want the same representative*.

The single-member district system

(1) Invites corruption in close districts by making too valuable the few votes that suffice to turn the scale.

(2) Fosters petty ward politics in cities and the “pork barrel” in state and nation.

(3) Robs of all interest in voting the many citizens who must take their choice between voting for a candidate who is almost sure to lose and voting for one they do not want.

(4) Makes possible minority rule according to the votes as cast. In this connection see the first diagram on pages 6-7.

(5) Fosters “machine rule” by making it impossible for voters of a party who disapprove of the machine candidate to nominate or vote for a rival member of the party without “splitting the party vote” and probably delivering the seat to some other party. The resulting machine rule is seldom anything like majority rule.

(6) Excludes from representation great numbers of voters—all except the largest party or faction in each district. Deprives the legislative body of the services of the strongest out-and-out spokesmen of the people, especially those of minority opinions and interests, some of which history will show to have been precious to society. Leaves great bodies of citizens without a voice

THE AMERICAN PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION LEAGUE

President

WILLIAM DUDLEY FOULKE

Vice-Presidents

JOHN R. COMMONS

WILLIAM S. U'REN

ALICE THACHER POST

Honorary Vice-Presidents

RT. HON. VISCOUNT BRYCE, ENGLAND

JOHN H. HUMPHREYS, ENGLAND

JAMES W. ROBERTSON, C. M. G., CANADA

COUNT GOBLET D'ALVIELLA, BELGIUM

PROFESSOR E. J. NANSON, AUSTRALIA

You are invited to become a member. The annual dues are \$1. This payment entitles the member to all publications issued by the League during the year, including the quarterly *Proportional Representation Review*. Many larger subscriptions are required to carry on the work. Please support the League as generously as you can.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

To the General Secretary:

Please enter my name in the list of members of the American Proportional Representation League.

I enclose Cash
Check
Postal Order amounting to \$.....

Signature.....

Address (good for printed matter).....

General Secretary-Treasurer, C. G. HOAG, 801 Franklin Bank Building, Philadelphia

(OVER)

A few copies of the League's publications, for use in introducing our work to others, will be supplied without charge to any member on request.

Supporters of the cause can help it greatly by showing copies of our publications to officers or directors of civic and other organizations with the suggestion that copies be ordered for distribution to the members.

(OVER)



in the public councils—to endure in silence or to resort to “direct action.” Makes the co-operation of all elements nearly impossible.

The last two of these disadvantages of the single-member district system are sufficient in themselves to account for a great part of the weaknesses and failures of American democracy, so-called. The Hare system of proportional representation gets rid of all six disadvantages.

The Hare System vs. the General Ticket or Block Vote

By the general ticket or “block vote” we mean the election of a representative body at large or in multi-membered districts, with each voter allowed to cast a separate vote for every member to be elected in the district. It is the general ticket or block vote, for example, that is used to elect the commission in cities governed under the commission-manager plan (except Ashtabula, Kalamazoo, and Boulder, which use the Hare system).

The general ticket or block vote

(1) Invites corruption by making too valuable the few votes that often suffice to turn the scale.

(2) Where there are more than two parties, makes possible minority rule according to the votes as cast. In this connection see the second diagram on pages 6-7.

(3) Fosters “machine rule” by making it impossible for voters of a party who disapprove of any or all of the machine candidates to nominate or vote for rival members of the party without “splitting the party vote” and probably delivering some or all of the seats to some other party. The resulting machine rule is often quite unlike majority rule.

(4) Lets the largest group of voters elect all the representatives, all other groups none. Deprives the legislative body of the services of representatives of the chief minority opinions and interests, some of which history will show to have been precious to society. Divides the district—the whole community, if the election is at large, as in most cities under the manager plan—into winners and losers. Leaves the losers without any voice in the public councils—to endure in silence or to resort to “direct action.” Makes the co-operation of all elements nearly impossible.

The third and fourth of these disadvantages of the block vote are ruinous to democracy and to the spirit of co-operation that should accompany it. The Hare system of proportional representation gets rid of all four disadvantages.

Where the Hare System of P. R. has been Adopted

(Inferior P. R. Systems Adopted far more Widely)

Tasmania (1896—Parliament, partial)	Boulder, Colorado (1917)
“ (1907—Parliament)	British Columbia (1917—Optional for
So. Africa (1909—Senate and some	Cities. Since adopted by several)
cities of the Transvaal)	Kalamazoo, Mich. (1918—Elections in
Transvaal (1914—Cities)	November, odd-numbered years)
Ireland (1914—Senate and part of Com-	Great Britain (1918—Eleven Seats in
mons, under “Parliament of Ireland	Commons)
Act”)	Scotland (1918—School Boards)
Ashtabula, Ohio (1915—Elections in No-	Sligo, Ireland (1918)
vember, odd-numbered years)	New South Wales (1918—Legislative
New Zealand (1915—Legislative Council,	Assembly)
Optional for Cities)	Ireland (1919—Municipalities. Elections
Sydney, Australia (1916)	in 127 to be held on January 15,
Durban, So. Africa (1916)	1920)
Calgary, Alberta (1916)	Many private organizations

Help from the League

The American Proportional Representation League, Franklin Bank Building, Philadelphia, is ready to help those who are making changes in the methods of electing representative bodies, public or private. Its secretaries will gladly give advice, without charge, in respect to the adaptation of proportional representation to any specific purpose, and will draft P. R. provisions for constitutions, charters, etc. Proposed applications of the principle should be submitted to them for criticism before it is too late for changes to be made, as the variations in its mode of application are unlimited and improvements in the technique of the count are likely to be made from time to time.

In so far as their other duties permit, the secretaries of the League will accept invitations to deliver addresses on proportional representation or on its adaptation to the government of cities, states, or private organizations. They are also prepared to carry out illustrative elections under the Hare system with the audience as voters. Ballots, tally sheets, result sheets, and other supplies are furnished by the League at nominal prices.

The Hare election provisions now recommended will be found in the Supplement to the *P. R. Review* for April, 1919, a copy of which will be mailed to any address on the receipt of ten cents (stamps accepted).

Proportional Representation Review

The *Proportional Representation Review*, organ of the League, is issued quarterly at eighty cents a year. It contains news of the movement throughout the world.

Membership

Those who believe in the principle of proportional representation are invited to join the League. The annual dues are one dollar. Larger subscriptions are greatly needed. The dues include a subscription to the *Review* and entitle the member also to any other publications issued during the year for general circulation.

American Proportional Representation League

President

WILLIAM DUDLEY FOULKE

Vice-Presidents

JOHN R. COMMONS

WILLIAM S. U'REN

ALICE THACHER POST

General Secretary-Treasurer

C. G. HOAG

Canadian Correspondent

H. S. ROSS, K. C.

20 St. Nicholas Street, Montreal

Honorary Vice-Presidents

RT. HON. VISCOUNT BRYCE

JOHN H. HUMPHREYS

England

JAMES W. ROBERTSON, C. M. G.

Canada

COUNT GOBLET D'ALVIELLA

Belgium

PROFESSOR E. J. NANSON

Australia

Address of the League: Franklin Bank Building, Philadelphia

Price of this leaflet (No. 5) 5 cents
 Per dozen, postpaid to one address . . 50 cents
 Per hundred, postpaid to one address . . \$3.50